

Docket No. F-6975

Ser. No. 09/857,861

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please find accompanying this response replacement sheet for Fig. 1
wherein amendments explained in the Remarks presented below are effected.

Docket No. F-6975

Ser. No. 09/857,861

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. To overcome the objection, Applicant has conformed Figure 1 to the disclosure at page 13, line 4 by amending the figure so that the GPS receiver is labeled 113.

Applicant notes that the claims have been renumbered as of the Amendment of June 4, 2004. The renumbering occurred at the U. S. Patent Office, probably just prior to the reassignment of the case from the prior Examiner, Examiner Coleman to the present Examiner, Examiner Behncke. The present Examiner (hereinafter "the Examiner") examined the renumbered claims for patentability and Applicant will henceforth do the same in this case.

Based on the new numbering, Claims 1-21 are pending and Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for allowing claims 1-12 and 17-19 and determining that Claim 14 would be allowed if rewritten to include the limitations of Claim 13.

Claims 13, 15, 16, 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Bouchard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,465,079). In response to the rejections, Applicant provides the following traverse.

Applicant has cancelled rejected claims 13, 15, 16 and 21. Regarding Claim 20, Applicant has deleted the language "behavior environment of said mobile object" as the reference fails to teach analyzing the identification of the operator or the behavioral history of the operator when performing the

Docket No. F-6975

Ser. No. 09/857,861

operating tendency analysis as already recited in the claim. Applicant introduces new Claim 22 depending from Claim 20 and containing the deleted language from Claim 20.

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. The fee of \$60.00 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Docket No. F-6975

Ser. No. 09/857,861

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,339
Attorney for Applicants
and,

By T. David Bommer
T. David Bommer
Reg. No. 48,710
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340